



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,065	12/14/2006	Stephen Brennom	CATT/0010	8289
26290	7590	10/09/2009	EXAMINER	
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.			MAUST, TIMOTHY LEWIS	
3040 POST OAK BOULEVARD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 1500			3751	
HOUSTON, TX 77056				

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/554,065	BRENNOM, STEPHEN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Timothy L. Maust	3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 11-14 and 17-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18 and 20-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 6, 7, 13 and 19 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/09/8/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejected in the office action on 2/13/09 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 23 and 25-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hundtofte (3249342).

Regarding claim 1, the Hundtofte reference discloses an apparatus (i.e., a loading tool; see Figure 2) for distributing solid particles into a tube (T), comprising: A center member (1); and a plurality of damper members (2) connected to the center member and arranged on the center member to provide substantially circumferential coverage along a longitudinal length of the tube (T), wherein individual ones of the plurality of damper members are axially spaced from one another along the center member and each one extends in a radial direction away from the center member toward an inside diameter of the tube. Further, the Hundtofte reference discloses the damper members may have a shaped surface similar to that of a propeller. Absent further defined structure of a loop, the outer periphery of the propellers would form loops

toward the inside diameter of the tube (see col. 2, lines 28-30). Further, the loading tool is automatically wound up via unit (7) during feeding.

Regarding claim 2, the method as claimed would be inherent during normal use and operation of the device.

Regarding claims 11 and 17, the blades (2) are made of Teflon, which is a plastic derivative.

Regarding claims 12 and 18, the blades (2) are attached or locked to the center member by wire or friction tape (3).

Regarding claim 20, see column 2, lines 13-19.

Regarding claims 23, 25-32, the damper members are rotationally distinct from each other, substantially horizontal, provide substantial coverage and are axially spaced each on one 180 degree radius, as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3-5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hundtofte in view of Minami (5795550).

Regarding claims 3-5, the Hundtofte reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed supra) including automatically winding in of the

center member as the tube is loaded, but doesn't disclose having a sensor that is utilized communicate the position of the center member. However, the Miname reference discloses another catalyst loading tool having a distance sensor 88 that determines the distance between the loading tool and the catalyst bed to keep the proper distance between the two. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hundtofte device to have a distance sensor (if not already) in view of the teachings of the Minami reference in order to keep the proper distance between the loading tool and catalyst bed. The first second and second portions being the unit (7) and the lower portion of the center member (1) adjacent the catalyst bed.

Claims 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hundtofte in view of Ryntveit et al. (5247970)

Regarding claims 8 and 14, the Hundtofte reference discloses the invention substantially as claimed (discussed *supra*), but doesn't disclose the center member (1) being a wire, chain, or a rod. However, the Ryntveit et al. reference discloses another catalyst loading device that discloses the central member (4) being an articulated rod, a wire, chain or the like to raise and lower damper members (7) (see column 2, lines 25-32). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute a wire, chain or articulated rod for the Hundtofte central member as, for example, taught by Ryntveit et al.; wherein so doing would amount to mere substitution of one functional equivalent central member for another

within the same art and the selection of any of these central members would work equally well in the Hundtofte device.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hundtofte.

The Hundtofte reference doesn't disclose adjustability of the damper members. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the dampers adjustable by employing different sized blades as needed, since it has been held that the provision of adjustability, where needed, involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Stevens*, 101 USPQ 284 (CCPA 1954).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 21 and 22 are allowed.

Claims 6, 7, 13 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy L. Maust whose telephone number is (571) 272-4891. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thur. 7:00-5:30pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy L Maust/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3751

10/8/09